

23 Jan 67

MEMORANDUM FOR THE RECORD

SUBJECT: Article Published in the Washington Post  
23 January 1967, "GSA Probes 3 Complaints  
of Chiseling on Paint Jobs" - Copy Attached

1. The allegations contained in the above article have been checked with Mr. Van Weaver, GSA Buildings Manager, and Mr. Fred Bayne, GSA Painting Supervisor assigned to this building.

2. The basic contract was made in the summer of 1965 by GSA with the Bainbridge Co. who subcontracted work to Clifton D. Mayhew. Original contract in the amount of \$159,000 specified that two coats of latex paint would be used on all interior surfaces. Latex paint was GSA specification type I TT-P-0029 which is an inexpensive rather thin type latex paint. Prior to the time that the contract was issued an effort was made by the GSA building management personnel and at the request of CIA personnel to change the paint specifications to an oil-based paint which would give an egg-shell sheen. This was in accordance with the recommendation made by [ ] ISD representative. Change order number one to contract effected this change at an additional cost of \$13,000. This particular paint was to be GSA specification TT-P-30, fortified, and is designed to give good coverage with one coat; however, the clause in the original contract specifying two coats was not changed nor was there any intention of reducing the number of coats from one to two. The paint was applied in accordance with union regulations which specified that four inch brushes and seven inch rollers could be used on the job.

*Were two applied?*

3. Essentially two coats were applied to most areas. In a few instances where "flashing" or "cat-tailing" occurred, three or more coats were applied. In a few instances where it was in the best interest of CIA and GSA only one coat was applied. In each of these cases both CIA and GSA were thoroughly cognizant of the situation.

Good records were maintained by GSA on "credits" due the Government because some particular spot in an area had been omitted at CIA request. Later most of these areas were painted by the contractor. In a very few instances these "credits" were "worked out" by the contractor in the form of extra work not covered by the contract.

*problem area?*

4. In a relatively few instances it was decided to use just one coat instead of two coats. This was done at the request of CIA or GSA representatives, and in each case both CIA and GSA were fully cognizant of the request. The type of circumstances which would bring about a decision to only use one coat would be in a vault or extremely sensitive area where the benefits of two paint coats were more than offset by the extra work and security precautions which would be required. Using the oil-based paint it was necessary to wait 24 hours before the second coat could be applied. In a very few instances where a large number of safes were involved the decision was made by CIA representative not to paint the wall covered up by the safe. Later, if and when the component moved, the touch-up painting would be done by the GSA painters assigned to the building.

5. Because of security considerations it was necessary to have most of the painting done at night. The contractor's personnel were under the Agency's escort at all times. No direct instructions were provided to the contractor by CIA personnel. The scheduling of areas to be painted was CIA's responsibility.

6. Contact with the contractor and his personnel was through Mr. Tully Saunders, the GSA engineer/inspector. Other GSA inspectors were Messrs. Abraham Goldsmith, Elmer I. Leander, and Alexander Yourshaw. Mr. Leander was the only one who could be contacted at this time as the others are on leave or not immediately available. Mr. Leander only worked a few weeks at the end of July and early August 1965. He stated that he was not aware of any problems of this nature mentioned in the newspaper article.

7. Mr. Van Weaver stated that there were no requests made for union stewards to be admitted to the building. If there had been requests of this nature, he stated that it would have come to his attention. There should not have been any problem in admitting the stewards under escort if such a request had been made.

Mr. Fred Bayne had no responsibilities for this contract. However, on several instances he was consulted and agreed to later assume responsibilities to paint a few areas where it was totally impractical to use the contractor. He was in a position to observe and made this statement:

"In my twelve years experience that (painting contract) was one of the best paint jobs the Government ever got."

STAT

SENDER WILL CHECK CLASSIFICATION TOP AND BOTTOM			
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL	
UNCLASSIFIED		SECRET	
CENTRAL INTELLIGENCE AGENCY OFFICIAL ROUTING SLIP			
TO		DATE	INITIALS
1		6 DO to Mar	Per
2			
3	JSW		Per
4	LLM		
5			
6			
ACTION		DIRECT REPLY	PREPARE REPLY
APPROVAL		DISPATCH	RECOMMENDATION
COMMENT		FILE	RETURN
CONCURRENCE		INFORMATION	SIGNATURE
Remarks:			
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Per the telecons.</i></p> <p>I've noted in margin, a couple of unanswered questions. . . Baynard claims that he has allegations that only one coat was applied. This by painters who allegedly worked on the job. .</p>			
FOLD HERE TO RETURN TO SENDER			
FROM: NAME, ADDRESS AND PHONE NO.			DATE
			30 Mar
UNCLASSIFIED		CONFIDENTIAL	
UNCLASSIFIED		SECRET	